



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,497	08/28/2003	Paul A. Blowers	P0011281.00/LG10126	6963
27581	7590	10/12/2010		
MEDTRONIC, INC. 710 MEDTRONIC PARKWAY NE MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-9924				
EXAMINER				
REYES, REGINALD R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3626				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/12/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rs.docketingus@medtronic.com

sso@cardinal-ip.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/650,497

**Applicant(s)**

BLOWERS ET AL.

**Examiner**

REGINALD REYES

**Art Unit**

3626

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13-22, 24-29, 31-36, 38-43, 45-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13-22, 24-29, 31-36, 38-43, 45-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Status of Claims***

1. This office action is made Final. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-22, 24-29, 31-36, 38-43 and the newly added claims 45-47 have been examined and are addressed below.

***Response to Amendment/Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/18/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to claim 1 Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach prioritizing with the prioritization engine, the received events and presenting with a user interface device, a list of the patients and a list of events for each of the patients based on the prioritization. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown on column 2 lines 10-17 of Reuter, the implantable device will receive data on clinically significant events/ received events. On column 5 lines 65-67 to column 6 lines 1-16 of Reuter, it states that the present invention determines a priority value (prioritization) for the lead impedance. Hatlestad shows displaying multiple health related parameters including applied therapy (events), device performance, etc (see for example Hatlestad paragraph 103). Duffin teaches on column 14 lines 25-29, a management system for monitoring implanted medical devices that provides data collection to one central site from all study patients (a list of events for each of the patients). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have found it obvious to combine/modify the prioritizing method taught by Reuter with the multiple health related parameters featured by Hatlestad and the telemetry system for implantable medical devices taught by Duffin

to prevent the implanted device from being overworked.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16-19, 22, 24-25, 28-29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39-41 and 43, 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Rueter U.S. Patent Number 5,944,745 in view of Hatlestad et al (U.S. 2004/0122294) and Duffin et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,292,698).
4. With respect to claims 1, 8, 17, 29, 33 and 39 Rueter teaches a method comprising: one or more remote monitors, wherein the one or more remote monitor obtain the events from interrogation of a medical device implanted within a patient, and with the prioritization engine, the received events and presenting, with a user interface device, a list of the events based on the prioritization (see for example 1 lines 44-48 and lines 65-67 and column 2 lines 1-9 and column 2 lines 10-25 and column 3 lines 33-36).

Reuter does not teach wherein the events include therapy events and diagnostic events nor does it teach receiving the events from a remote monitor. Hatlestad teaches the prioritizing engine to be external (see for example Hatlestad paragraph 87-88, 92-93 and 176-181 and Figs 10, 27-28). Hatlestad teaches data that includes therapy and

diagnostic data (see for example Hatlestad paragraph 41). Hatlestad further teaches a remote monitor that can access the PDA/prioritization engine (see for example Fig. 7 and paragraphs 87-88).

Rueter in view of Hatlestad does not teach prioritizing events obtained from a plurality of medical devices implanted in different patients; and presenting a list of the patients and a list of the events for each of the patients based on the prioritization. Duffin teaches, a management system for monitoring implanted medical devices that provides data collection to one central site from all study patients (see for example Duffin column 14 lines 25-29). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have found it obvious to combine the prioritizing method taught by Rueter with the features of Hatlestad to and the telemetry system for implantable medical devices taught by Duffin to prevent the implanted device from being overworked.

5. With respect to claims 3, 9, 11, 22, 24, 31, 34, 36 and 43, 47 Rueter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the method of claim 1 (as described above). Rueter teaches wherein prioritizing events includes prioritizing the events based on a relative importance associated with the events (see for example Rueter column 1 lines 65-67 and column 2 lines 1-9).

6. With respect to claims 4, 13, 25, 32 and 38 Rueter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the method of claim 1 (as described above). Rueter teaches further comprising invoking a special action in response to an event with a relative importance

that exceeds a threshold (see for example Rueter column 7 lines 66-67 and column 8 lines 1-4).

7. With respect to claim 7, 16 and 28 Rueter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the method of claim 4 (as described above). Duffin teaches wherein the special action includes generating an alarm, notifying a clinician, and notifying a patient (see for example Duffin column 3 lines 13-19 and column 14 lines 3-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of application to combine both features to better monitor patients and their implanted medical devices.

8. With respect to claims 10 and 35 Reuter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the method of claim 8. Hatlestad teaches further comprising assigning the relative importance based on a set of rules (see for example Hatlestad paragraph 176). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have found it obvious to combine the prioritizing method taught by Reuter with the features of Hatlestad with the same reason mentioned above.

9. With respect to claims 18 and 40, Rueter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the system of claim 17 (as described above). Duffin teaches further comprising a data management application that parses raw data from the implantable medical device, and populates fields of a database with event data (see for example Duffin column 13 lines 65-67 and column 14 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of application to combine both features to get an updated data.

10. With respect to claims 19 and 41 Rueter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the system of claim 18 (as described above). Duffin teaches wherein the event data comprises one of patient name, device type, date event data was parsed, and event type (see for example Duffin column 14 lines 45-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of application to combine both features to gather effective data.

11. Claims 5, 6, 14, 15, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rueter U.S. Patent Number 5,944,745 in view of Hatlestad et al (U.S. 2004/0122294) and Duffin et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,292,698) and Hwang U.S. Patent Number 5,920,271.

12. With respect to claims 5, 14 and 26 Rueter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the method of claim 4 (as described above). Rueter in view of Hatlestad does not teach wherein the special action comprises using a conspicuous text format when presenting data from the event. Hwang teaches wherein the special action comprises using a conspicuous text format when presenting data from the event (see for example Hwang column 5 lines 58-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine both features to alert the user the importance of certain messages are.

13. With respect to claims 6, 15, and 27 Rueter in view of Hatlestad, Duffin and Hwang teaches the method of claim 5 (as described above). Hwang teaches wherein the conspicuous text format includes one of font, bold text, highlighted text, underlined text, and italicized text (see for example Hwang column 5 lines 58-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine both features to alert the user the importance of certain messages are.

14. Claims 20, 21 and 42, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rueter U.S. Patent Number 5,944,745 in view of Hatlestad et al (U.S. 2004/0122294) and Duffin et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,292,698) and Webb et al U.S. Patent Number 7,060,031.

15. With respect to claim 20 Rueter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the system of claim 17 (as described above). Rueter in view of Hatlestad does not further comprising a database to store the prioritized events, wherein the user interface device includes a web browser to access the prioritized events via a network connection. Webb teaches further comprising a database to store the prioritized events, wherein the user interface device includes a web browser to access the prioritized events via a network connection (see for example Webb column 13 lines 66-67 and column 14 lines 1-2 and Fig 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features to have better accessibility to the database.

16. With respect to claim 21, 46 Rueter in view of Hatlestad, Duffin and Webb teaches the system of claim 20 (as described above). Webb teaches further comprising a derivation engine to generate additional events based on the stored events (see for example Webb column 17 lines 63-67 and column 18 lines 1-15 and Fig 7A).

17. With respect to claim 42 Rueter in view of Hatlestad, Duffin and Webb teaches the system of claim 39 (as described above). Webb teaches further comprising a derivation engine to generate additional events based on the stored events (see for example Webb column 17 lines 63-67 and column 18 lines 1-15 and Fig 7A). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine both arts to better service the clients.

18. Claims 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Rueter U.S. Patent Number 5,944,745 in view of Hatlestad et al (U.S. 2004/0122294) and Duffin et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,292,698) and Tamura (5,434,611).

19. With respect to claim 45 Rueter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin teaches the method of claim 1. Reuter in view of Hatlestad and Duffin does not teach wherein presenting, with a user interface device, the list of the patients and the list of the events comprises presenting the list of the patients and the list of the events such that the clinician can simultaneously view events obtained from multiple implantable medical devices associated with multiple patients. Tamura teaches a terminal that the voice information and the images which have been sent from the cameras and the sender-

receiver terminals are received in the time sharing manner by the monitoring television receiver and the transmitter-receiver of the doctor's terminal 130 in the medical office. As a result, a plurality of patients can be automatically monitored (see for example Tamura column 5 lines 35-49). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have found it obvious to combine the features of Reuter, Hatlestad and Duffin with the home health care system which employs a two-way community antenna television network to permit communication between a doctor and patients at different locations with the motivation of patients can be automatically monitored at home using images and voice by the doctor in the medical office, without hindrance to normal CATV broadcasting.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 6,083,248 teaches world wide patient location and data telemetry system for implantable medical devices.

U.S. Patent No. 6,2374,973 teaches implantable medical device for sensing absolute blood pressure and barometric pressure.

U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0204147 teaches method and apparatus for injection of external data within an implantable medical device.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REGINALD REYES whose telephone number is (571)270-5212. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Morgan can be reached on 571-272-6773. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. R./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3626

/Robert Morgan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626